

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant : Gregg D. Wilensky Art Unit : 2109
Serial No. : 10/526,287 Examiner : Unknown
Filed : March 1, 2005 Conf. No. : 6269
Title : REDUCTION OF SEARCH AMBIGUITY WITH MULTIPLE MEDIA
REFERENCES

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

SUPPLEMENTAL INTERVIEW SUMMARY

The applicant would like to thank Examiner Emerson again for his courtesy and professionalism in conducting an interview on October 30, 2007, after issuance of the Office Action dated July 10, 2007.

The applicant received the examiner's Interview Summary dated November 14, 2007 and would like to clarify an argument for the examiner's convenience. The examiner stated that:

Applicant argued that the limitation of combining information pertaining to a feature common to a plurality of reference objects was not met by Barber in that the reference objects used are not searched for a common feature to form a reference object to search for (the intersection of features).

As a clarification, the applicant argued that Barber does not anticipate “a feature common,” as recited by claim 1, for example. In the interview, the applicant explained this argument using, as an example, FIG. 2 of the application to illustrate a “feature common”. A “feature common”, however, is not limited to intersecting features, or the intersection of features, as suggested by the examiner’s Interview Summary. Additionally, claim 1 recites that information pertaining to a feature common to a plurality of reference objects is combined to produce composite reference information, not “a reference object,” as stated above by the examiner.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 14, 2007

/Daniel J. Burns/

Daniel J. Burns
Reg. No. 50,222

PTO Customer No. 21876

Fish & Richardson P.C.

Telephone: (650) 839-5070

Faxsimile: (650) 839-5071